UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,585	08/18/2003	Steven L. Scott	1376.700US1	4004

21186 7590 09/26/2005

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0938

EXAMINER	
TSAI, SHENG JEN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2186	

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/643,585	SCOTT, STEVEN L.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sheng-Jen Tsai	2186	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 August 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *01/17/2005*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11 are presented for examination in this application (10,643,585) filed on August 18, 2003.

Acknowledgement is made to the Information Disclosure Statement received on January 27, 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 and 5-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schimmel (US 6,105,113), and in view of Fossum et al. (US 4,888,679).

As to claim 1, Schimmel discloses **a computer system** [figure 3] **comprising**:

a network [interconnection network (figure 3, 344)],

one or more processing nodes connected via the network [figure 3], **wherein each processing node includes**:

a plurality of processors [figures 2 and 3; column 7, lines 1-7], **wherein each processor includes a scalar processing unit, a vector processing unit and means for operating the scalar processing unit independently of the vector processing unit** [see below]; **and**

a shared memory connected to each of the processors [main memory, figure 3, 328~342; column 6, lines 59-67], **wherein the shared memory includes a cache** [processor + cache (figure 3, 312~326; cache coherency directory (figure 3)]; **wherein processors on one node can load data directly from and store data directly to shared memory on another processing node via the network** [column 7, lines 8-13].

Regarding claim 1, Schimmel does not teach that **each processor includes a scalar processing unit, a vector processing unit and means for operating the scalar processing unit independently of the vector processing unit**. However, the concepts of scalar processors and vector processors is well known and widely used in the art. Essentially every PC has a scalar processor for data processing, and vector processors are commonly used for graphic applications (see Microsoft Computer Dictionary, 5th edition, 2002, Microsoft Press, page 548 – vector and page 549 – vector graphics). Further, Fossum et al. disclose in their invention "Method and Apparatus Using a Cache and Main memory for Both Vector Processing and Scalar Processing by Prefetching Cache Blocks Including Vector Data Elements" an apparatus comprising a vector processor (figure 1, 22; figure 7, 116) and a scalar processor (figure 1, 21; figure 7, 108) where the scalar processor and the vector processor operate independently of each other (figure 7; column 2, lines 35-68; column 3, lines 1-43). Including both scalar and vector processors in a computer system with a cache allows the prefetching of block data using the vector processor and increases the data throughput (column 2, lines 12-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of

ordinary skills in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to recognize the benefit of having both scalar and vector processing units, as demonstrated by Fossum et al., and to incorporate it into the existing apparatus disclosed by Schimmel to further enhance the performance of the system.

As to claim 2, Schimmel teaches that **the shared memory further includes a Remote Address Translation Table (RTT), wherein the RTT translates memory addresses received from a first processing node into physical addresses within the shared memory of a second processing node** [when a CPU requires a translation, CPU or an operating system searches TLB. If the translation is not found in TLB (i.e., a TLB "miss"), the desired translation is loaded from the page tables in memory by hardware, software, firmware, or any combination thereof (column 9, lines 20-29); figures 5-8 show the page tables and translation tables to facilitate translations of a virtual address into a physical address; figure 9 shows the steps of obtaining the desired translation from the beginning to the end, including step 928, send PTE to processor, and step 930, place PTE, VM address tag and PTE address tag in TLB; figures 5-8 show the page tables and translation tables to facilitate translations of a virtual address into a physical address; these tables are stored in the main memory or cache (figure 8), which are distributed among and shared by all the nodes (figure 3), hence they are generally accessible on the physical node (column 7, lines 1-7)].

As to claim 3, Schimmel teaches that **the shared memory further includes a plurality of cache coherence directories, wherein each processing node is**

coupled to one of the cache coherence directories [optional cache coherency directory associated with each node in figure 3].

As to claim 5, Schimmel teaches that **the processing nodes include at least one input/out (I/O) channel controller, wherein each I/O channel controller is coupled to the shared memory of the processing node** [column 7, lines 14-22].

As to claim 6, Fossum et al. teach that **each scalar processing unit contains a scalar cache memory** [cache, figure 1, 24 is associated and shared by the scalar (21) and vector (22) processing units], **wherein scalar cache memory contains a subset of cache lines stored in the shared memory cache.** [column 4, lines 15-54];
a plurality of address latches each of which for outputting register set address bit by latching a address, in response to the register set control signal and the self-refresh signal when the mode register set signal is applied [column 8, lines 3-18]; **and**
a partial array self-refresh controller for selectively activating the plurality of control signals by decoding the plurality of register set addresses depending on input of the internal address [the refresh controller, figure 2, 217; column 6, lines 39-45].

As to claim 7, a router is a well-known component widely used in computer networks to facilitate data transportation from one node to another (see Microsoft Computer Dictionary, 5th edition, 2002, Microsoft Press, page 458 – router).

As to claim 8, refer to "As to claim 1."

As to claim 9, refer to "As to claim 2."

As to claim 10, refer to "As to claim 3."

As to claim 11, refer to "As to claim 3."

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schimmel (US 6,105,113), in view of Fossum et al. (US 4,888,679), and further in view of Nakazato (US 6,782,468).

As to claim 4, neither Schimmel nor Fossum et al. teach that **each processor includes two vector pipelines**. However, Nakazato discloses in the invention "Shared Memory Type Vector Processing Syatem, Including a Bus for Transferring a Vector Processing Instruction, and Control Method Thereof" an apparatus comprising multiple vector pipelines in each processor (n vector processing units, figure 2, 14a~14n) and a scalar processor (figure 2, 11). Including multiple vector processors in a computer system allows the multiple vector processing tasks to be performed simultaneously and increases the data throughput. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to recognize the benefit of having multiple vector processing units, as demonstrated by Nakazato, and to incorporate it into the existing apparatus disclosed by Schimmel and Fossum et al. to further enhance the performance of the system.

5. ***Related Prior Art***

The following list of prior art is considered to be pertinent to applicant's invention, but not relied upon for claim analysis conducted above.

- Deneau, (US 6,684,305), "Multiprocessor System Implementing Virtual Memory Using a Shared Memory, and a Page Replacement Method for Maintaining Paged memory Coherence."
- Frank et al., (US 6,490,671), "System for Efficiently Maintaining Translation Lookaside Buffer Consistency in a Multi-Threaded, Multi-Processor Virtual Memory System."
- Hansen, (US 6,101,590), "Virtual Memory System with Local and Global Virtual Address Translation."

Conclusion

6. Claims 1-11 are rejected as explained above.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheng-Jen Tsai whose telephone number is 571-272-4244. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Kim can be reached on 571-272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sheng-Jen Tsai
Examiner
Art Unit 2186

September 15, 2005

PIERRE BATAILLE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
9/20/05